DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 203 899 JC 810 276

AUTHOR Stetson, Nancy
TITLE Relationship between Systematic Planning at Community Colleges and Goal Agreement.
PUB DATE Nov 80
NOTE 87p.: M.S. Thesis, Central Washington University.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes: *Administrators: *College Planning: *Community Colleges: Literature Reviews: *Organizational Objectives: Questionnaires: Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

A survey of 121 administrators at four community colleges was conducted to determine the degree to which the colleges utilized a systematic, rather than sporadic, planning process; to measure the extent to which administrators at each college agreed upon the importance of specific institutional goals; and to test the hypothesis that a strong correlation exists between goal agreement among administrators and the college's use of systematic planning. During the study, the administrators were asked to respond to two instruments: a six-item questionnaire soliciting information on management practices that are indicative of systematic planning and the Community College Goals Inventory, which requires respondents to rate, on a five-point scale, the importance of 90 goals as they exist at the college and as the administrators would like them to exist. The study revealed that the administrators at the two community colleges exhibiting more systematic planning efforts felt that there was less of a discrepancy between actual and ideal college goals than administrators at the colleges using less systematic planning. The study report reviews planning literature, describes planning efforts at six community colleges, details study methodology and procedures, and reports findings and conclusions. Questionnaires are appended. (JP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED203899

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SYSTEMATIC PLANNING AT COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND GOAL AGREEMENT

A Thesis

Presented to

the Graduate Faculty

Central Washington University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science

---

by

Nancy Stetson

November 1980

JC 810 276

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Nancy Stetson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

APPROVED FOR THE GRADUATE FACULTY

Kenneth T. Hanaka
COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

Alexander H. Howard Jr.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SYSTEMATIC PLANNING
AT COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND GOAL AGREEMENT

by

Nancy Stetson

November 1980

The relationship between systematic planning at community colleges and goal agreement among administrators was studied. Sixty-nine administrators at four community colleges were surveyed. The results showed that administrators at the two community colleges who perceived their institutions to be relatively more systematic in planning also perceived relatively smaller gaps between what were, and what should be the goals of their institutions. By this measure, community college administrators demonstrated a consistent and positive relationship between systematic planning and goal agreement.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express sincere appreciation to Dr. Kenneth Harsha, Dr. Alexander Howard, and Dr. Alma Spithill for their guidance and support during my graduate study. As an off-campus student, I needed special assistance on many occasions and I am grateful for the extra effort put forth by these people, especially that of the chairman of my committee, Dr. Harsha.

I also would like to express thanks to Dr. Charles Kinnison, formerly senior associate at McManis Associates, Inc. and new president of Tadlock Associates, Inc., for his assistance throughout this study. Finally, I would like to thank Dr. James Davis, president of Wenatchee Valley College, for his encouragement and moral support.

CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Systematic Planning	3
Statement of the Problem	5
Hypothesis to be Tested	6
Definition of Terms	7
Limitations of the Study	9
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	11
Systematic Planning	11
Caldwell Community College	15
Cuyahoga Community College	16
Delaware County Community College	17
Gadsden State Junior College	18
Parkersburg Community College	19
Western Wisconsin Technical Institute	20
Goal Setting	21
Goal Agreement or Consensus	22
Influences of Systematic Planning or Goal Setting on Decision Making	24
III. DESCRIPTION AND PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY	28
Procedures of the Study	28
Population of the Study	33

Chapter Page

IV. RESULTS 34

Response Rate 34

Comparison of Data Between Sample and Non-Sample . . . 35

Means 36

Standard Deviations 40

Discrepancies 42

Comparison of Data Among Four Institutions in Sample . 44

Degree of Systematic Planning 44

Degree of Goal Agreement 48

Standard Deviations 49

Discrepancies 51

Test of Hypothesis 52

V. CONCLUSIONS 55

Summary 55

Conclusions 56

BIBLIOGRAPHY 60

APPENDIXES 65

A. NINETY GOAL STATEMENTS IN COMMUNITY COLLEGE GOALS INVENTORY 65

B. SIX STATEMENTS IN CURRENT PLANNING PRACTICES ASSESSMENT . 72

C. LETTER FROM KINNISON 74

D. TWENTY GOAL AREAS IN COMMUNITY COLLEGE GOALS INVENTORY . . 76

TABLES

Table		Page
I.	Means of Responses to Goal Areas as Perceived to be Important	38
II.	Means of Responses to Goal Areas as Preferred to be Important	39
III.	Standard Deviations of Responses to Goal Areas as Perceived to be Important	41
IV.	Standard Deviations of Responses to Goal Areas as Preferred to be Important	43
V.	Discrepancies Between Means of Responses to Goal Areas as Perceived and Preferred to be Important	45
VI.	Discrepancies Between Means of Responses to CCGI Goal Statement on Systematic Institutional Planning	47
VII.	Means of Responses to Six Statements on Current Planning Practices	47

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

As American colleges and universities enter the 1980s, they face a changing environment: demographic, economic, and social. Undergraduate enrollment, already stabilizing at some institutions and decreasing at others, is predicted to decline 5 to 15 percent by the year two thousand (11:55). Unless enrollment-driven funding systems are changed, financial support will decline at least at the same rate and might be eroded even further by continued double-digit inflation, taxpayer revolts, and the public's lack of confidence in higher education. How will colleges and universities cope with the future? Despite the severe problems lying ahead, the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education advised that it was "better to plan to meet the future effectively than just to fear it as a new dark age." (11:55)

Planning to meet the future is not a new concept for colleges and universities. Both Plato and Aristotle talked about the "proper tasks to be set" for higher education three thousand years ago (43:31). Certainly the idea of planning is not new in American higher education. It could be argued, with considerable historical justification, that planning has been a part of the administration of American colleges and universities since the founding of Harvard in 1636 (38:vii). However, not unlike the corporate world which demonstrated a keener interest in long-range planning during the economic recession of the late 1950s, higher education renewed its interest in strategic planning when

OCT 9

enrollment increases began to slow in the late 1970s. Prior to that time, college and university planning had been sporadic and limited in scope.

From 1880 to the mid-1970s, college and university enrollments grew at a compound rate of 5 percent a year and the percentage of the Gross National Product spent on education multiplied twenty times (25:7). College and university administrators, attempting to build new programs and facilities to meet the increasing enrollments, had little time or motivation to plan beyond the next year's building projects. Primarily limited to curriculum and facilities, even those planning activities were carried out as though they bore no relationship to each other or to the long-range future. Using a straight-line projection, the future seemed predictable.

In the last half of the 1970s, however, increases in student enrollment slowed, and the census bureau projected a 23 percent decline of eighteen to twenty-four-year-old people by 1997 (11:55). Some college and university administrators began to discuss the need to adjust the purposes and programs of their institutions or else look forward to a steady decline in enrollment. Less reliant upon the traditional-age student than the four-year college and university, the community college heard conflicting testimony about what it might expect in the future. Unlike that of the four-year college or university, the mission of the newest institution in higher education was still in a state of flux. Clark Kerr described the community college's unique place in history.

> There are many within the community college movement and outside observers of it who believe that these colleges already have as many functions as they can handle, or have too many; that they should cut back to their essential missions; that they should stop adding and begin subtracting. This is not my view of where they stand in the

> process of their historic evolution. I consider them as still being in a dynamic and not yet entering a static phase of their development. I view them as being the most protean, the most plastic, the most mobile of all the institutions of higher education. They comprise the least immutable, the least immobile, the least riveted of the sectors. Their future course is the least predictable, the least settled in terms of roles to be performed. They are still evolving in the womb of time (25:4-5).

From 1960 to 1980, community college enrollments increased even faster than four-year college and university enrollments. In 1960, only one-sixth of all students of higher education were enrolled in community colleges. By 1980, community colleges accounted for one-third of student enrollment and by the year two thousand, according to the Carnegie Council, they would account for two-fifths (25:8).

Systematic Planning

During the last half of the 1970s, whether in response to the changing environment or in recognition of the need for clearly stated missions and goals at any given point in time, a number of community colleges became involved in planning, more specifically in comprehensive, systematic short and long-range planning. Among the many benefits anticipated was that systematic planning would help community colleges continuously assess their mission and goals against the changing needs of the population and, therefore, provide a continuously updated and rational framework within which decisions could be made (5, 26, 32). Evidence suggested that if an institution's goals could be clearly stated and agreed upon, administrators and other decision makers would be more likely, as well as more able, to make decisions supportive of those goals (35:7). Thus, the goals likely would be achieved more efficiently and effectively. Many institutions were

assisted in their planning and other administrative improvement efforts with grants, most significantly through the federal Higher Education Act's SDIP, or Strengthening Developing Institutions Program.

The primary source of direct federal assistance to higher education, SDIP was authorized in 1965 to aid those institutions which, for financial and other reasons, were struggling for survival and were isolated from the main currents of academic life (19:12). By the early 1970s, the United States Office of Education, responsible for administering SDIP, recognized that simply making grants to developing institutions for academic improvements did not ensure the efficient and effective use of funds. The Office of Education then began to direct a significant portion of the funds toward improving the developing institution's long-range administrative or management capability, specifically to help institutions implement comprehensive planning, management, and evaluation, or PME, systems.

By 1980, more than one-fourth of all institutions of higher education in the United States had received approximately one billion dollars in SDIP grants (46). Many of these institutions, including community colleges, contracted with outside agencies to help them implement the Office of Education's closed-loop PME system. The prevailing model viewed the three functions as interrelated in moving the institution toward greater efficiency and effectiveness, not just in the use of SDIP funds, but in its use of all available resources: human, material, and fiscal. The closed-loop system guaranteed that the results of evaluation continuously would feed back into the planning efforts.

McManis Associates, Inc., an agency which assisted more than one

hundred SDIP-funded institutions over a period of ten years, helped a number of community colleges develop PME systems (10:8). Kinnison, a senior associate at McManis and an expert in community college planning, stated the case for systematic, as opposed to sporadic, planning.

> The sporadic approach involves attempts to plan whenever the need becomes so great that its importance outweighs whatever other issues are competing for attention. This approach results in a flurry of planning activity after a major disquieting event such as: reduction in force, anticipated accreditation visit, poor accreditation visit report, initiation of collective bargaining, rejection by voters of a referendum, etc. The sporadic approach also leads people to believe that planning is done once a decision has been made, a problem resolved, or a plan written. People become deluded by believing that planning is unnecessary in the interim until a new need for it arises. In contrast, a systematic approach incorporates planning as a normal part of the institution's way of life. The systematic approach has some similarities to a well-designed machine that effectively produces results in the quantity and quality needed and does so by using resources effectively. The systematic approach enables a college to easily identify a problem and resolve it as a part of the normal operation. Standard procedures and tools are available for addressing the problem as well as for fine-tuning the system itself to better fit it to changing conditions. Questions about future directions, decisions, and actions are resolved routinely with participation by appropriate people according to a predefined process, a <u>plan for planning</u> (26:II-4).

Statement of the Problem

A community college may establish its goals and objectives through a systematic or sporadic planning process, or by some other goal-setting method. Once established, the goals and objectives provide a framework within which administrators, both as individuals and as a group, can make decisions about the future. Parekh believed individual administrators or administrative units should derive their responsibilities from the overall institutional goals, implying that responsibilities for goal achievement often overlap, in effect become group goals (40:10). Horwitz found that when a group goal was fully accepted by a

member he would be more likely to be involved in efforts toward group goal attainment (22). To the extent members of the primary decision-making group understand and agree on the goals of the institution, then individual and group decisions could be expected to be more efficiently and effectively directed toward the attainment of those goals.

As community colleges enter the 1980s, they face a changing demographic, economic, and social environment. According to Kerr, they also have the least predictable course relative to their mission. Whether in response to these or other factors, many community colleges are implementing systematic planning processes. The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between systematic planning and goal agreement among administrators. If it could be shown that a consistent and positive relationship existed between the use of a systematic approach to planning and closer goal agreement among administrators, it would provide evidence to community colleges that the process of systematic planning could assist them in reaching goal agreement among administrative groups. Agreed-upon goals then could provide a commonly understood and accepted framework within which more effective and efficient decisions could be made.

Hypothesis to be Tested

This study will ask the question: Will administrators in those community colleges which use a more systematic approach to planning express closer agreement toward the goals of their institution than administrators at community colleges which use a less systematic approach to planning? Two statistical measures of agreement will be utilized: standard deviations from the means of responses to twenty

goal areas both as they are perceived to be important and as they are preferred to be important, and discrepancies between the means of responses to twenty goal areas as they are perceived to be important and as they are preferred to be important at the respondent's institution.

The null hypothesis of this study is: There is no relationship between a community college's use of a systematic approach to planning and goal agreement among administrators.

Definition of Terms

This study involved many key words and concepts with meanings specific to the realm of community college planning. Following is a list of definitions of these terms as they are used throughout this document.

Administrators, managers, and decision makers are used interchangeably to describe those line and staff employees who are responsible for managing the institution, exclusive of faculty, counselors, and non-professional staff.

Community College Goals Inventory, or CCGI, is an instrument developed by Educational Testing Service and field tested in 1979. It was developed as a tool to help colleges delineate their goals and establish priorities among them. The theoretical framework for the CCGI consists of twenty goal areas for which preliminary comparative data based on responses from the eighteen colleges which participated in the CCGI field test are available.

Educational Testing Service, or ETS Field Test is the field test in which eighteen community colleges, including 321 administrators, participated in January and February of 1979 which established preliminary

comparative data for the CCGI. In this study, the administrators at the eighteen community colleges are referred to as the non-sample group.

Evaluation is the process of assessing the actual performance of the institution, as weighed against the intended outcomes and measurable objectives. Within the context of this study, evaluation is relevant to the extent it is assumed to be one of the three components of a planning, management, and evaluation system. In a fully functioning system it would influence future planning in a closed-loop formation.

Goals are desired future states or conditions which, if attained, will contribute to the achievement of the institutional mission.

Goal agreement or consensus is the degree to which a group of administrators express agreement on the relative importance of twenty goal areas as measured by CCGI. Specifically, the degree of agreement is measured by standard deviations from the means of responses to twenty goal areas both as they are perceived to be important and as they are preferred to be important, and by discrepancies between the means of responses to twenty goal areas as they are perceived to be important and as they are preferred to be important at the respondent's institution.

Management consists of the administrative processes and techniques which are used to achieve the institutional goals and objectives derived from the planning process. One of these administrative processes is decision making.

Perceived goals are those goals which, in the judgment of an individual administrator, are perceived to be important at his or her institution.

A plan is a written document or documents setting forth the

goals and objectives of the institution and specifying programs and courses of action designed to achieve them.

Planning is the on-going, dynamic and continuous process by which an institution reassesses its mission and establishes its derivative goals and objectives. An institution-wide, proactive process, it establishes the intended outcomes to which resources--human, material, and fiscal--available to an institution will be committed if the external and internal conditions occur as predicted.

Preferred goals are those goals which, in the judgment of an individual administrator, should be important at his or her institution.

A systematic approach to planning, as opposed to a sporadic one, develops guides for performance that can serve as a base for later evaluating results. It also establishes a framework within which administrators can reach more effective and efficient decisions. In this study, three methods for determining the degree of systematic planning currently practiced at community colleges are utilized. These methods will be described in chapter three.

Limitations of the Study

This study was limited geographically to Michigan, Washington, and West Virginia. This study also was limited to administrators at community colleges. It is acknowledged that many constituents other than administrators have a stake in the efficient and effective administration of an institution: students, faculty, boards of trustees, other employees, taxpayers, and federal, state, and local agencies. No conclusions can be drawn from this study relative to goal agreement among or between these various constituents, nor can any conclusions be drawn

about the varying degree to which these constituents were involved in planning or goal setting.

The preliminary comparative data utilized in the study were provided by ETS and were based on responses of administrators at the community colleges which participated in the CCGI field test. The eighteen colleges which participated in the field test were limited geographically to California, Florida, Iowa, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, and South Carolina. The degree of systematic planning practiced at the eighteen colleges at the time of the CCGI field test is unknown. The criteria by which the eighteen colleges were chosen by ETS also are unknown. However, none of the eighteen colleges was surveyed as a part of this study, nor did any appear in the literature reviewed by the investigator as institutions involved in systematic planning efforts.

Chapter II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

While the literature reviewed did not reveal any documented studies involving systematic planning and its relationship to goal agreement, it did reveal interrelated discussion concerning systematic planning, both theoretical and experiential; goal setting, both as a separate process and as one component of systematic planning; goal agreement or consensus; and the influence of both systematic planning and goal setting on decision making. While the discussions often overlapped, these four general areas will be explored as separately as possible in order to provide a theoretical framework for this study.

Systematic Planning

General agreement existed among management experts that planning was an important function of management. Predating the concept of planning, management, and evaluation, or PME, by over thirty years, Porter divided the basic management functions into planning, implementation, and inspecting, or planning, doing, and controlling (44). Drucker specified setting objectives or planning as one of five basic operations in the work of a manager, with the others identified as organizing, motivating and communicating, measuring, and developing people (13:353). In transferring the concept to educational administration, McManis adopted the U. S. Office of Education's language: planning, management, and evaluation, and asserted that those processes could, and must be devel-

oped as one integrated system, i.e., a PME system. He defined planning as "that institutional process by which the college establishes its mission and its derivative goals and objectives." (34:I-1) Management addressed those policies and operating decisions which enabled the college to achieve the objectives which were derived from the planning process. Evaluation was concerned with determining the actual performance of the institution as weighed against the intended outcomes. Kinnison later defined the administrative process of planning as "the process of interpreting expectations of others about the college into intentions by the college." (27:II-6) More specifically, he defined systematic planning as "an institution-wide, proactive process that establishes the intended outcomes to which available resources will be committed if external and internal conditions occur as they have been predicted." (26:II-10)

A number of writers emphasized the need for planning to be comprehensive, to include academic, fiscal, administrative, and facilities planning at the institutional level, as well as the need to integrate it into state and federal planning (16, 28, 52). A number of writers also detailed a variety of different processes, stages, phases, and steps in systematic planning (23, 37, 39, 41, 49, 55). Richardson, noting the variety, stated:

> There is substantial agreement about the essential characteristics of the planning process, although the agreement does not extend to implementation strategies, and a variety of strategies have emerged. All assume the availability of basic information, and numerous quantitative analytic tools have been developed (47:1).

In 1976, Freeman undertook a survey of the fifty-six largest research universities in the United States to determine which ones had developed comprehensive planning systems, what the characteristics of

such systems were, and how effective they were. No similar survey of community colleges was found in the literature, although the investigator was aware that at the time of this study Van Ausdle at Walla Walla Community College in Washington was in the process of conducting such a survey. Because the Freeman study, conducted at the University of Pittsburgh, was judged by the investigator to be particularly relevant to this study, his results were examined at some length.

Freeman defined comprehensive institutional planning as a formal system for integrating long-range academic, administrative, financial and facilities planning for the whole institution and its principal components. According to Freeman, the four primary functions of management were planning, organizing, directing, and controlling. Within the context of PME then, Freeman divided management into organizing and directing.

> Planning, which forms the framework within which the other management functions are carried out, may be thought of as a systematic process for determining trade-offs among alternative activities which could be implemented to achieve a set of goals over time. Planning is not an attempt to forecast future events or to determine future decisions. On the contrary, planning focuses on what Peter Drucker has called the 'futurity of present decisions.' What do we need to do today in order to be ready for the uncertainties of tomorrow? (16:34)

According to the Pittsburgh study, eight important trends in university planning emerged. Interest in comprehensive planning was growing, with most systems having been developed within the five previous years. Planning processes tended to be centrally controlled, with the president playing a leading role in initiating and controlling the planning process and, in virtually all cases, a central planning office responsible for directing the process had been established high in the administrative structure. Planning processes tended to be highly structured, with

detailed written plans, policies, procedural guidelines, and disciplined methods for consideration and approval of revisions to plans and assessment of resource requirements developed. Planning was dominated by resource considerations, with an emphasis on quantitative analyses of institutional resources and the costs of academic programs, rather than on qualitative evaluations of programs. Planning systems relied heavily on data collection and analysis, commonly referred to as management information systems. Trustees, faculty members, and students were demanding greater participation and, in those institutions where planning was seen as something more than an exercise, and particularly where resource allocations were tied directly to academic planning, faculties had begun to seek a stronger voice in planning. The influence of external agencies was growing, accelerating the development of management information systems. Conceptual approaches to planning varied widely, indicating little, if any, sharing among institutions; for the most part, planning systems were self-designed to meet individual institutional needs.

On the basis of the Pittsburgh study, Freeman tentatively identified twelve principles of planning, admitting that the practice was too new and the evidence too slight for proposing theory. Nonetheless, Freeman suggested requirements for effective planning might include: (1) strong leadership and commitment, (2) clear definitions of purposes, mission, and goals, (3) coordination, (4) broad participation, including trustees, administrators, faculty members, and students, (5) a substantial financial commitment, (6) a link between academic and financial concerns, (7) clearly defined procedures, (8) written plans, (9) flexibility, (10) comprehensiveness, integrating academic, administrative,

financial, space, personnel, and enrollment planning simultaneously at all levels, (11) complete, accurate, consistent, and timely information, through management information systems and appropriate analytical models, and (12) a means of evaluating performance, not only for assessing the relative importance of programs, but for evaluating the planning system itself.

Freeman pointed out that while written plans were important, the disciplined process required to develop, analyze, review, and approve written plans was even more important. Parenthetically, the investigator would like to note that, from a university perspective, broad participation might be limited to trustees, administrators, faculty members, and students. However, as Knoell and McIntyre suggested, participation in community college planning might include community representatives as well. "Community college planning differs from that of most of higher education because of local decision making, responsibility for providing education to the entire community, and concern for what students are like as well as for how many there are." (28:ix)

Within the context of the trends and tentative principles suggested by the Pittsburgh study, the experiences of six community colleges and their systematic planning efforts were explored.

Caldwell Community College

According to Altieri, long-range insitutional planning was instituted at Caldwell Community College and Technical Institute in Hudson, North Carolina, in 1973. During its first cycle, the planning team consisted of selected administrators, including the president, faculty, and the board of trustees chairman. The planning model was simi-

lar to the PME model encouraged by McManis and Kinnison, a closed-loop system. Two of the thirteen components of the model addressed institutional philosophy or mission, and institutional goals.

Caldwell was one of several institutions to receive special funding from the Danforth Foundation to assist it in developing a long-range plan. It also was a member of ACCTion, a consortium funded under the Higher Education Act's SDIP, or Strengthening Developing Institutions Program, and formed to offer technical assistance to two-year developing colleges nationwide (2).

Cuyahoga Community College

Cuyahoga Community College in Cleveland, Ohio, became engaged in long-range or strategic planning in 1975. Ellison, chancellor at the multi-campus district, expressed strong support for strategic planning.

> There is no choice. There may have been, in the early years of the community college movement--the decade of the 50's and 60's--but today public skepticism and ever more scarce resources make strategic planning a question of institutional survival. Particularly in community colleges that have been somewhat insulated from market forces, failure to plan now for the uncertain future can mean slow but certain decline. So the question facing all administrators in higher education is not whether but how (14:32).

Ellison stressed the need for the involvement of the chief executive officer and his top executives. According to Ellison, students also played an integral role in strategic planning at Cuyahoga, as did the board.

> By definition, strategic planning deals with issues falling primarily in the area of policy consideration and, therefore, within the purview of a community college's board of trustees. When board action is being sought, the wise executive will assure that board members (preferably via a standing committee) have been kept abreast of critical information related to good planning and that clear, careful analysis has been provided. "When?" and "how much?" are not simple questions when transmitting information to a board for policy decision-making. In this light the chairman of the CCC Board has indicated that he believes the most important policy approved by the

> board is the enactment of the budget each year. This act sets in motion for another year the real expression of what the institution is to be over the next 12 months (14:35).

The six-step or six-phase strategic planning process at Cuyahoga was based on Uyterhoeven, Ackerman, and Rosenblum's Strategy and Organization. While Ellison admitted the need for good information in strategic planning, he also expressed the fear that some administrators, in attempting to use all the data available to them through computer-based information systems, might "delude themselves. Very little information is truly critical, and there is no use wasting time trying to understand a plethora of extraneous data." (14:35)

Strategic planning and other improvement efforts at Cuyahoga Community College were supported by funds from a local community foundation, institutional funds, and SDIP. Ellison stated that though many people at many levels could supply data and analysis useful for strategic planning, he viewed it as inherently a centralized executive-based function.

Delaware County Community College

Involved in the design, development, and implementation of a planning, management, and evaluation system since 1976, Delaware County Community College's need for more systematic planning was determined by its board of trustees, in conjunction with the executive staff. In 1976, Delaware County Community College, located in Media, Pennsylvania, received 1.2 million dollars in support from SDIP for a four-year program aimed at developing management systems, staff skills and educational program modification. Credit for "remarkable progress" in systematic planning since that time was given "mainly to the commitment of

the Board of Trustees and the Chief Executive Officer." (26:III-6)

The planning process at Delaware County was based on the Parekh model, utilizing scenario and mission, and institutional goals by program as two of twelve components. Another component, institutional evaluation, looped back into the scenario and mission, prescribing a closed-loop system. At Delaware County, research supporting the planning process produced evaluation of effectiveness of all programs, curricula, and support services. While the planning process was objective-based, Delaware County apparently recognized the importance of qualitative, as well as quantitative evaluation. Other research products included the evaluation of new program proposals, measuring student outcomes and goal accomplishment, measuring cost effectiveness of programs and support services, estimating and modeling budget alternatives, assessing community needs, and labor market information. Delaware County solicited broad participation of faculty, administration, and the board of trustees in strategic planning but its managers believed, as did those at Cuyahoga, that strategy must be set at the top (26).

Gadsden State Junior College

Gadsden State Junior College in East Gadsden, Alabama, began to develop a formalized process for planning in 1975. Gadsden was awarded an SDIP grant for a four-year period beginning in 1975. The Gadsden director of planning and research reiterated the need for presidential involvement and commitment to systematic planning. The president served as ex-officio chair to the Committee on Institutional Planning.

One of three task forces established by the Committee on Institutional Planning recommended a planning system pioneered by Dr. Philip

Winstead at Furman University in South Carolina. Winstead's system was analogous to a person taking a trip, asking a series of seven questions, one of which--where do I want to go?--was goal-oriented. Administrators at Gadsden believed the advantages of the Winstead system were integration of strategic planning, program planning, management by objectives, evaluation, budgeting, and policy development.

During the first year of development, the Committee on Institutional Planning was appointed by the president and consisted of top-level administrators, division chairmen, faculty, and students, with the director of planning and research as operating chair. As mentioned, the president served as ex-officio chair. At Caldwell Community College, students originally were not involved in the planning team but the board was involved. At Gadsden just the opposite was true. As at Caldwell, the second year brought changes to the system: heavier board of trustees involvement at Caldwell and, at Gadsden, the involvement of middle-level administrators (5).

Parkersburg Community College

McClenney, president at Parkersburg Community College in Parkersburg, West Virginia, implemented systematic planning at Eastfield College, Dallas County Community College, and at Parkersburg. While no detailed description of the planning process at Parkersburg was apparent in the literature, McClenney strongly stated the role of the president in planning.

> One of the most significant ways for a president to provide leadership in planning is to initiate a systematic planning program. A good planning process, if successful, will enable the president to anticipate changes in the future, clarify organizational priorities, and fairly allocate resources. The planning process is simply a means to the end of fulfilling the purpose of the college. There is

> no particular method that's 'the best' for writing objectives. Numerous planning systems have been developed, but each college needs to tailor a program to meet its specific needs (32:3).

At an SDIP-funded meeting of a national consortium on planning for fiscal stability held in March of 1980, which the investigator attended, McClenney spoke in some detail about the planning process at Parkersburg. He outlined eight elements of what he called the "game plan," or model, with one element being goals.

The Planning Council at Parkersburg was an institution-wide group, consisting of faculty, staff, students, and administrators, and functioned as an advisory group to the president. According to McClenney, his primary influence on planning was "feeding good data" to the Planning Council. A unique feature at Parkersburg was that its annually updated three-year plan was only seven pages long (31).

Western Wisconsin Technical Institute

The "plan for planning" at Western Wisconsin Technical Institute in La Crosse, Wisconsin, was developed in 1978. According to Korschgan, planning specialist at Western Wisconsin, five phases were identified: (1) establishment of the foundation, (2) implementation of the planning process, (3) resource allocation, (4) evaluation, and (5) recommencing the cycle. The need for an integrated data base upon which to make management decisions was identified, as was the involvement of a broad cross-section of the institution in the enactment of the plan, and a method of linking planning with state and federal needs. It was not evident from the literature how Western Wisconsin would review its mission and goals on an overall institutional level. Western Wisconsin Technical Institute was awarded an SDIP grant in 1978 (26).

Using the Pittsburgh study of the experiences at research universities as a guide, it would appear community colleges have had similar experiences as they undertook to implement planning systems.

Goal Setting

The nature of goals and goal setting, as a process apart from systematic planning, was found to be compatible with the concepts encountered in systematic planning literature.

According to Etzioni, an organizational goal is a desired state of affairs which the organization attempts to realize and, further, an organizational goal is the future state of affairs which the organization as a collectivity is trying to bring about (15:6-8). Thompson and McEwen thought of goals as dynamic variables and viewed goal setting essentially as a problem of defining desired relationships between an organization and its environment. Change in either the organization or the environment required review and perhaps alteration of goals and, therefore, an organization needed an on-going process for goal setting. They also recognized that reappraisal of goals appeared to be more difficult as the "product" of the enterprise became less tangible and more difficult to measure objectively (54:23).

Within the context of systematic planning, Halstead believed the beginning basis for sound planning was a clear understanding of the ultimate ends or objectives. It was not possible to plan systematically for the unknown.

> Goals, initially defined and subsequently modified by the direction of an organization, cannot be established in a vacuum. They can be clearly stated only after a thorough analysis of the organization and its environment. For this reason, goal-setting and subsequent modifications are continuing phases of planning, not

> merely the first step. Frequently, realistic goals cannot be specifically stated until after alternative solutions to existing problems have been determined (18:17-18).

Freeman also stressed that effective planning required clear definitions of purposes, mission, and goals.

> One cannot draw a road map without knowing in advance where one is going. The developers of a comprehensive planning system must begin by clearly stating its purposes and its role within the management structure of the organization. Once these are determined, the mission of the university, as well as the particular goals and objectives of its principal organizational components, must be decided upon. Those aims should be defined in ways that will permit them to be measured so that assessing their achievement will be possible (16:47).

Goal Agreement or Consensus

Hughes believed organizational goal setting and consensus formation to be keys to organizational effectiveness (23). Thibaut and Kelly thought the degree of group consensus was dependent upon, among many things, members' judgments of the amount of personal satisfaction they would derive from attainment of the group goal, their assessments of the costs incurred by them in the process, and their estimates of the probability the group goal would be attained (53).

According to Breuder and King, institutional goal determination had two end products: (1) identification of goals, and (2) establishment of priorities among goals. Further, they stated that an institution's "goal structure" could be said to have been determined when some level of consensus had been reached through a process which was democratic and participatory. They believed goals must be developed which accommodated the needs of diverse constituencies and responded to changing societal demands, and that prioritized goals must be used in the administrative decision-making process (7:8).

Cartwright and Zander viewed a group goal as being a composite of individual goals for the same group. Groups differed in their degree of consensus concerning group goals and consensus would vary within the same group over time as a result of changing group or situational factors (8). Blake and Mouton believed when "men master success by being effective in working with and through others in the achievement of the purposes of the firm, there is no contradiction between personal and corporate objectives. They are congruent." (6:64)

In his well-known discussion of management by integration and self-control, or Theory Y, McGregor made six assumptions about industrial behavior. One of these assumptions was, man would exercise self-direction and self-control in the service of objectives to which he was committed.

> Theory Y managers believe that people will voluntarily accept corporate goals as a means to their own, that they do want to work and are capable of self-motivation, and that they will have personal goals that are compatible with company goals--particularly if they are allowed to participate in goal setting (33:32).

McGregor believed there were several characteristics of effective task group behavior: (1) the task or the objective of the group would be well understood and accepted by the members, (2) there would have been free discussion of the objective at some point until it was formulated in such a way that the group could commit itself to it, and (3) most decisions would be reached by a kind of consensus in which it would be clear that everybody was in general agreement and willing to go along (33:234). He also believed members of a cohesive group would work at least as hard to achieve group objectives as they would to achieve individual ones and that they could achieve "unity of purpose." (33:242)

In reaching goal agreement or consensus, Ackoff pointed out the

need to recognize the existence of what he called "stylistic objectives" of the management team. Overall objectives, in addition to being based upon realistic premises about strengths and resources of the organization and the external environment in which it operated, should be congruent with the stylistic objectives, or emotionally-based preferences of the management team. By making these stylistic preferences explicit, without reference to the test of profitability, the air would be cleared for more consistent and enthusiastic rational pursuit of both preferred and economically appropriate goals (1).

Influences of Systematic Planning or Goal Setting on Decision Making

In attempting to develop a logical, if untested, relationship between systematic planning or goal setting and decision making, both theoretical and experiential references were utilized. In some cases, the relationship was implied rather than stated directly, but many of the stated results of systematic planning could have been achieved only through decision making.

The Higher Education Management Institute stated two benefits of planning: (1) it stimulated the development and clarification of institutional philosophy, goals, and objectives, and (2) it provided a framework for management and decision making. Additionally, it enhanced collegiality within the institution through widespread participation in planning and decision making (20:2.1.1). Kinnison listed a number of benefits of planning, among them that it provided more rational bases for allocating limited resources among competing requests, and it guided changes that were necessary in programs and services to assure contin-

uing relationships with the educational needs those programs and services were designed to meet (26:I-1).

Merson and Qualls believed strategic planning would result in a more effective use of resources and a longer-range perspective for decision making (36). Parekh, whose model for planning has gained wide acceptance, gave seven reasons for long-range planning, among them that it would provide a commonality of understanding about the mission and goals of the institution and the strategies to implement them, encourage better allocation and utilization of resources, and help direct energies away from the nonessential to the essential activities (40:10).

According to Randolph, who addressed the practical benefits of long-range planning in the business world, research showed that corporations which earned over a 10 percent return on investment after taxes--the elite of the American industry--had only one thing in common: their top managers spent over 50 percent of their time planning (45:114). The main benefit Roueche, Baker, and Brownell ascribed to planning was that decision making became a process over which managers had firm control (49:25).

Community colleges which had implemented systematic planning processes stated a variety of benefits. At Delaware County Community College, there was the distinct feeling the college was engaged in rational decision making which would make it an even more valued community institution in the future (26:III-6). At Gadsden State Junior College, results summarized after two years of systematic planning included: (1) a priorities-based resource allocation process, (2) improved utilization of faculty, and (3) broader, more effective participation in institutional decision making (5:3). McClenney also

stated that planning resulted in more effective decision making (32:3).

Jones clarified the integral relationship between planning and decision making by insisting that, to be effective, the planning process must at some point result in a set of decisions (24:83). McManis and Harvey believed the management process, the "M" in PME, could help assure that decisions reached at all levels within the institution would result in actions, activities, or directions which materially contributed to the realization of the institution's goals, objectives, and supporting plans. They asserted planning should not be separated from the decision-making process and it should focus on providing information to decision makers for more rational decisions (35:7).

In attempting to develop a relationship between goal setting and decision making, Richardson, Blocker, and Bender stated their belief that a failure to develop clear and attainable objectives at each operating level permitted staff offices to pursue different and in some instances conflicting priorities (48:315). Scott agreed, to the extent organizational goals were diffuse and lacking in clarity, and to the extent multiple, possibly conflicting goals were being pursued, the organization would lack the rational basis for making critical decisions (50).

According to Etzioni, the actual effectiveness of a specific organization could be determined by the degree to which it realized its goals, and its efficiency could be measured by the amount of resources used to produce a unit of output (15:6-8). Gross and Grambsch thought the concept of goal was central in the study of organizations. "Goal attainment is an aspect of all systems which, in order to survive, must attain whatever goals they set for themselves. In the formal organi-

zation, the problem of goal attainment has primacy over all other problems." (17:4)

Latham and Locke cited a "critical incidents" survey conducted by Dr. Frank White in which approximately one third of the participants were managers. Participants were asked to describe a specific instance in which they were especially productive and one in which they were especially nonproductive in their present jobs. It could be assumed decision making would be included in a manager's perception of productivity. The goal category was the one most frequently used to describe high and low-productivity incidents (29:76). While Latham and Locke's review of the research literature focused on individual employee motivation rather than on group motivation, they agreed that when the degree of task interdependence was high, as in attempting to attain overall organizational goals, group goal setting should be considered (29:78).

Drucker, one of the nation's leading corporation consultants, summed up the critical relationship between goals and decision making. He stated, "one of the most crucial jobs in the entire decision-making process is to assure that decisions reached in various parts of the business and on various levels of management are compatible with each other, and consonant with the goals of the whole business." (13:353)

While the review of the literature revealed no documented study specifically relevant to the relationship between systematic planning and goal agreement, it did provide both theory and research supporting a positive relationship between systematic planning or goal setting, and more effective and efficient decision making. Logically, it could be assumed that administrative goal agreement would precede effective and efficient administrative decision making.

Chapter III

DESCRIPTION AND PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between systematic planning and goal agreement among community college administrators.

Procedures of the Study

The study used a mailed inventory or questionnaire, the CCGI, or Community College Goals Inventory, and the opinion of an expert in community college planning. The questionnaire assessed two factors related to this study: (1) the degree of systematic planning practiced at each of four community colleges, and (2) the degree of goal agreement demonstrated by administrators at each of four community colleges. The expert, Dr. Charles J. Kinnison, formerly of McManis Associates, Inc. and now president of Tadlock Associates, Inc., assessed the degree of systematic planning practiced at each of the four community colleges.

The CCGI was used as the instrument to which administrators were asked to respond because its format reflected the content and focus of community college goals. Added features of this instrument were that it included as one of its ninety goal statements a statement specifically addressing the importance of being organized for systematic short and long-range planning for the whole institution, and it provided for six optional information questions which were used in this study as one of three methods for assessing the degree of systematic planning practiced

at each of the four community colleges.

The CCGI, an adaptation of the widely used Institutional Goals Inventory, was developed by ETS in cooperation with the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. It was designed to help community and junior colleges define their educational goals, establish priorities among those goals, and give direction to their present and future planning. The CCGI does not tell colleges what their goals are or how to reach desired goals. It provides a means by which individuals and groups can contribute their thoughts about them. Summaries of these thoughts can serve as a basis for reasoned deliberation toward final definition of college goals.

Individual colleges can use CCGI for such purposes as accreditation self studies and long-range planning activities. In addition, goal studies involving multi-college districts or statewide community college systems can provide useful information about goals the several colleges, individually and as a group, consider to be important for the present and for the future. A college can make the most effective use of CCGI by comparing responses from different subgroups within the college. Faculty, administrators, trustees, and community groups are examples of possible subgroups. The instrument allows for five subgroups. For purposes of this study, subgroups consisted only of administrators at each of four community colleges.

Procedures used to assess the degree of systematic planning practiced at each of four community colleges were: (1) an analysis of the data reported by Educational Testing Service for the individual goal statement which addressed the importance of being organized for systematic short and long-range planning for the whole institution, (2) an

analysis of the data reported by administrators and tabulated by the investigator for six statements which addressed the adequacy of certain factors believed by the investigator and Kinnison to be critical to systematic planning, including a separate analysis of the data reported for one of the six statements which addressed the adequacy of the current mission and goals statement of the community college, and (3) the opinion of Kinnison.

The procedure used to assess the degree of goal agreement demonstrated by administrators at each of four community colleges was an analysis of the data reported by administrators and tabulated by ETS for twenty CCGI goal areas.

The individual CCGI goal statement which addresses the importance of being organized for systematic short and long-range planning for the whole institution appears as statement seventy-five in Appendix A. The six statements, including the statement on mission and goals, which address the adequacy of certain factors believed by the investigator and Kinnison to be critical to systematic planning are detailed in Appendix B. The opinion of Kinnison is evidenced by a letter in Appendix C. The twenty CCGI goal areas are described in Appendix D.

The first part of the CCGI inventory, Appendix A, consists of a series of ninety possible community college goals. Respondents indicated their views of these goals on a five-point scale ranging from "of no importance" to "of extremely high importance," both as they existed at the college, and as the respondents would like them to exist. About half the statements referred to outcome or substantive goals colleges might seek to achieve, such as qualities of students, curriculum emphases, and community services. The remainder of the statements related to

process or support goals dealing with the college climate and the educational process.

The CCGI summary data report from ETS grouped eighty of the ninety goal statements into ten outcome and ten process goal areas, with each of the twenty goal areas incorporating four of the eighty goal statements. Responses to the ten additional goal statements were tabulated and reported but were not included in any of the twenty goal areas. All responses were tabulated and reported by four subgroups, namely the administrators at each of four community colleges, and by total group.

In order to determine if the sample group, as a whole, differed from administrators at other community colleges, preliminary comparative data available from the ETS field test of the CCGI were utilized. The data were available only for the twenty goal areas, not for the ninety goal statements. Consequently, except for the individual goal statement on systematic institutional planning, the study limited itself to the analysis of data for the twenty goal areas.

The specific measures utilized in the analysis of data which assessed the degree of systematic planning practiced at each of four community colleges were: (1) the average discrepancies between the means of responses on a five-point scale to the CCGI goal statement on planning as it was perceived to be important and as it was preferred to be important at the respondent's institution, (2) the average means of responses on a ten-point scale to the six statements of adequacy in current planning practices as a total, (3) the average means of responses to the one statement of adequacy in the institution's current statement of mission and goals, and (4) the opinion of Kinnison.

Kinnison divided the four community colleges into groups of two, judging one group to be more systematic in planning than the other group, although he judged all four community colleges to be involved in systematic planning efforts to some degree. The ten-point scale utilized for assessing current planning practices by responses to the six statements ranged from a one of "totally inadequate" to a ten of "totally adequate."

The specific measures utilized in the analysis of data which assessed the degree of goal agreement among administrators at each of four community colleges were: (1) standard deviations of responses to twenty goal areas both as they were perceived to be important and as they were preferred to be important, and (2) discrepancies between the means of responses to twenty goal areas as they were perceived to be important and as they were preferred to be important. The standard deviations for the twenty goal areas indicated the relative degree of agreement or consensus within the respondent group with regard to each goal area. The smaller the standard deviation, the greater the agreement as to its relative importance. According to ETS, one would generally expect smaller standard deviations for the perceived than for the preferred ratings, since the former are perceptions of present reality while the latter are in the nature of personal opinions about the way things should be. The discrepancies between the means indicated the degree of satisfaction with the institutional status quo in the view of the constituent group in question. A relatively large discrepancy implied discontent or a sense of aspiration toward new accomplishments. A relatively low discrepancy suggested satisfaction or agreement between the perception of present reality and the way things

should be.

The study was completed over a period of approximately eight months. The presidents of five community colleges were contacted by letter in March of 1980, all five of whom were suggested to the investigator by Kinnison. The letters asked for permission to survey all administrators at the institution, using the CCGI, guaranteeing that the results would be confidential and made available to presidents for use in goal setting or planning. All but one president agreed to participate. At that point, another president at a community college believed by Kinnison to be involved in systematic planning was contacted and agreed to participate. The five presidents were asked to identify the number of administrators, including themselves, at their institutions according to the definition given in Definition of Terms. The instruments were mailed to presidents or designees, coded as subgroups one through five, in early May and were to be returned the week of May 26. By June 23, one institution's surveys had not been returned and the institution was dropped from the study.

Population of the Study

The study was limited, originally, to five community colleges because the CCGI Summary Data Report allowed for five subgroups. They all were judged to be involved in systematic planning efforts, although at varying stages.

Presidents or their designees identified those persons at their institutions whom they considered to be administrators. The responses were analyzed by the investigator, with the results presented in chapter four.

Chapter IV

RESULTS

The results of the analysis of data will be presented as follows: (1) a documentation of the response rate, (2) a comparison of data between the preliminary comparative data available for administrators at the eighteen community colleges who participated in the ETS, or Educational Testing Service field test, and the data available, as a total group, for administrators at the four community colleges who participated in this study, (3) the analysis of data for assessing the degree of systematic planning practiced at each of the four community colleges, and (4) the analysis of data for assessing the degree of goal agreement among administrators at each of the four community colleges.

Response Rate

Community College Goals Inventories were mailed to 121 administrators at five community colleges: thirteen at Community College One, thirty-five at Community College Two, twenty-six at Community College Three, thirty-four at Community College Four, and thirteen at Community College Five. Community College Two did not return its instruments and was dropped from the study.

Only those inventories in which two sections were completed and returned, both the assessment of current planning practices and goals inventory, were tabulated for the study, with one exception. Community College One returned four of twelve instruments in which administrators

completed the goals inventory only. Because of the relatively large percentage involved, 31 percent of administrators at that institution, and because the investigator had assured each president the data for his institution would be made available to him, ETS was instructed to score the four instruments as though they were a separate subgroup, subgroup two. However, ETS included the four instruments in the totals for the goal inventory but, because of the small number, did not include them as a separate subgroup.

Community College One returned twelve instruments, eight of which had both sections completed, for a usable return of 61.5 percent. Community College Three returned eighteen instruments, seventeen of which had both sections completed, for a usable return of 65.4 percent. Community College Four returned thirty-three instruments, thirty-two of which had both sections completed, for a usable return of 94.1 percent. Community College Five returned thirteen instruments, all of which had both sections completed, for a usable return of 100 percent. Overall, not counting Community College Two, which was dropped from the study, nor the four responses from Community College One which were included in the totals but not as a separate subgroup, the return rate was 80.2 percent, or sixty-nine of the eighty-six returns possible for an intact group of four community colleges. The total sample group, including the four from Community College One which did not appear as a subgroup, numbered seventy-three.

Comparison of Data Between Sample and Non-Sample

The investigator utilized the preliminary comparative data available from the administrators who participated in the ETS field

test to determine if there were differences between the sample, specifically the seventy-three administrators who were surveyed by the investigator, and the non-sample ETS field test group. It was believed the 321 administrators in the non-sample group were not involved in systematic planning efforts. None of the four community colleges surveyed were participants in the ETS field test and none of the eighteen community colleges participating in the ETS field test appeared in the literature reviewed by the investigator as being involved in systematic planning efforts. All four community colleges in the current study were believed to be involved, in varying degrees, in systematic planning efforts.

A comparison of data between the sample and the non-sample groups was made in means of responses, standard deviations from the means of responses, and discrepancies between the means of responses to twenty goal areas as they were perceived to be important and as they were preferred to be important at the respondent's institution.

It should be noted that, both for sample and non-sample groups, ETS computed means, standard deviations, and discrepancies for each of the twenty goal areas by averaging administrator responses to four individual goal statements. It should be noted further that the total sample group included four responses from Community College One which did not appear as a separate subgroup nor in the total for Community College One.

Means

The lowest and highest means of responses to all twenty goal areas as they were perceived to be important by the non-sample group

at their institutions were 2.27 and 3.57, a range of 1.30. The lowest and highest means of the sample group were 2.38 and 3.72, a range of 1.34. The difference between the ranges of the means was .04, or a 3.1 percent wider range of the means for the sample group.

The sample means were higher than the non-sample means in seventeen out of twenty cases, or 85 percent. When the twenty non-sample means were averaged, the average mean of responses was 2.8995. When the twenty sample means were averaged, the average mean of responses was 3.0575, a difference of .158, or 5.4 percent higher average means for the sample group. For complete data, see Table I, page 38.

The lowest and highest means of responses to all twenty goal areas as they were preferred to be important by the non-sample group at their institutions were 3.07 and 4.36, a range of 1.29. The lowest and highest means of the sample group were 2.89 and 4.34, a range of 1.45. The difference between the ranges of the means was .16, or a 12.4 percent wider range of the means for the sample group.

The sample means were lower than the non-sample means in sixteen out of twenty cases, or 80 percent. When the twenty non-sample means were averaged, the average mean of responses was 3.8685. When the twenty sample means were averaged, the average mean of responses was 3.818, a difference of .05 or 1.3 percent lower average means for the sample group. For complete data, see Table II, page 39.

The sample group means appeared to be different from the non-sample group means in that the sample group demonstrated: (1) a 3.1 percent wider range of perceived-importance means, (2) higher perceived-importance means in 85 percent of the cases, (3) 5.4 percent higher average perceived-importance means, (4) a 12.4 percent wider range of

Table I

Means of Responses to Goal Areas
as Perceived to be Important

Goal Area	Non-Sample Mean	Sample Mean	CC One Mean	CC Three Mean	CC Four Mean	CC Five Mean
1	3.57	3.61	3.53	3.63	3.73	3.40
2	2.97	3.07	3.09	3.18	3.13	2.85
3	3.06	3.37	2.75	3.68	3.61	3.00
4	2.29	2.42	2.53	2.18	2.46	2.52
5	2.77	3.07	2.66	3.01	3.23	3.04
6	2.49	2.60	2.34	2.57	2.68	2.54
7	3.48	3.72	3.47	4.01	3.83	3.25
8	2.86	3.31	2.88	3.26	3.60	2.96
9	2.68	3.07	2.38	3.18	3.26	3.06
10	2.27	2.38	2.31	2.29	2.44	2.40
11	3.14	3.29	2.94	3.04	3.60	3.12
12	3.09	3.04	2.84	2.85	3.32	2.88
13	2.91	2.97	2.56	3.24	3.06	2.71
14	2.59	2.56	2.13	2.41	2.69	2.75
15	2.53	2.71	2.19	2.88	2.85	2.58
16	2.72	2.86	2.22	3.04	3.13	2.50
17	3.01	3.00	2.81	2.99	2.95	3.17
18	3.46	3.62	2.97	3.93	3.72	3.53
19	3.02	3.27	2.66	3.28	3.77	2.62
20	3.08	3.21	2.91	3.49	3.46	2.54
Average	2.8995	3.0575	2.7085	3.107	3.226	2.871

Table II

Means of Responses to Goal Areas
as Preferred to be Important

Goal Area	Non-Sample Mean	Sample Mean	CC One Mean	CC Three Mean	CC Four Mean	CC Five Mean
1	4.18	4.20	4.38	4.09	4.32	3.96
2	4.13	3.92	4.13	3.79	4.03	3.75
3	4.04	3.98	3.91	4.06	4.02	3.88
4	3.07	3.05	3.31	2.75	3.13	3.08
5	4.03	3.86	4.03	3.72	3.87	3.87
6	3.65	3.46	3.63	3.38	3.42	3.52
7	4.36	4.34	4.34	4.35	4.37	4.15
8	4.21	4.19	4.53	3.91	4.31	4.04
9	3.58	3.66	3.78	3.50	3.67	3.77
10	3.07	2.89	3.47	2.51	2.83	3.10
11	4.09	4.04	4.44	3.74	4.26	3.60
12	3.71	3.58	3.88	3.18	3.83	3.29
13	4.03	3.90	3.75	3.56	4.12	3.98
14	3.76	3.70	4.03	3.10	3.92	3.69
15	3.70	3.67	4.00	3.38	3.74	3.69
16	4.28	4.27	4.03	4.10	4.55	4.17
17	3.34	3.31	3.22	3.19	3.41	3.31
18	4.01	3.92	3.84	4.04	3.97	3.73
19	4.16	4.25	4.25	4.12	4.37	4.21
20	3.97	4.17	4.17	4.07	4.26	4.10
Average	3.8685	3.818	3.956	3.627	3.92	3.7445

preferred-importance means, (5) lower preferred-importance means in 80 percent of the cases, and (6) 1.3 percent lower average preferred-importance means.

Standard Deviations

The smallest and largest standard deviations from the means of responses to all twenty goal areas as they were perceived to be important by the non-sample group at their institutions were .84 and 1.08, a range of .24. The smallest and largest standard deviations of the sample group were .73 and 1.04, a range of .31. The difference between the ranges of the standard deviations was .07, or a 29.2 percent wider range of the standard deviations for the sample group.

The sample standard deviations were smaller than the non-sample standard deviations in fourteen out of twenty cases, or 70 percent. In three cases, the sample standard deviations were the same as the non-sample standard deviations. When the twenty non-sample standard deviations were averaged, the average standard deviation was .921. When the twenty sample standard deviations were averaged, the average standard deviation was .8775, a difference of .04, or 4.7 percent smaller average standard deviations for the sample group. For complete data, see Table III, page 41.

The smallest and largest standard deviations from the means of responses to all twenty goal areas as they were preferred to be important by the non-sample group at their institutions were .69 and 1.10, a range of .41. The smallest and largest standard deviations of the sample group were .64 and 1.05, a range of .41, exactly the same as the non-sample range.

Table III

Standard Deviations of Responses to Goal Areas as Perceived to be Important

Goal Area	Non-Sample S.D.	Sample S.D.	CC One S.D.	CC Three S.D.	CC Four S.D.	CC Five S.D.
1	.89	.77	.72	.69	.80	.70
2	.86	.79	.57	.73	.81	.81
3	.91	.91	.87	.78	.84	.76
4	.85	.75	.58	.67	.74	.65
5	.88	.83	.64	.81	.86	.73
6	.89	.80	.73	.82	.81	.70
7	.92	.87	.96	.70	.82	.87
8	.91	.91	1.12	.83	.82	.67
9	.91	.94	1.06	.95	.81	.84
10	.84	.73	.81	.77	.72	.60
11	.97	.85	.88	.81	.79	.55
12	.96	.95	.91	.73	.83	.68
13	.96	.86	.84	.74	.79	.84
14	.96	.84	.76	.83	.78	.81
15	.84	.80	.67	.82	.79	.69
16	.92	.91	.79	.91	.81	.83
17	1.08	1.02	1.05	1.08	1.00	.84
18	.98	.98	1.05	.81	.85	.89
19	.95	1.04	.86	1.07	.80	.88
20	.94	1.00	1.03	.97	.89	.88
Average	.921	.8775	.845	.826	.818	.761

The sample standard deviations were smaller than the non-sample standard deviations in eighteen out of twenty cases, or 90 percent. When the twenty non-sample standard deviations were averaged, the average standard deviation was .865. When the twenty sample standard deviations were averaged, the average standard deviation was .8, a difference of .065, or 7.5 percent smaller average standard deviations for the sample group. For complete data, see Table IV, page 43.

The sample group standard deviations appeared to be different from the non-sample group standard deviations in that the sample group demonstrated: (1) a 29.2 percent wider range of perceived-importance standard deviations, (2) smaller perceived-importance standard deviations in 70 percent of the cases, (3) 4.7 percent smaller average perceived-importance standard deviations, (4) smaller preferred-importance standard deviations in 90 percent of the cases, and (5) 7.5 percent smaller average preferred-importance standard deviations.

Discrepancies

The smallest and largest discrepancies between the means of responses to all twenty goal areas as they were perceived to be important and as they were preferred to be important by the non-sample group at their institutions were +.33 and +1.56, a range of 1.23. The smallest and largest discrepancies of the sample group were +.30 and +1.41, a range of 1.11. The difference between the ranges of the discrepancies was .12, or a 9.8 percent smaller range of the discrepancies for the sample group.

The sample discrepancies were smaller than the non-sample discrepancies in nineteen out of twenty cases, or 95 percent. When the

Table IV

Standard Deviations of Responses to Goal Areas as Preferred to be Important

Goal Area	Non-Sample S.D.	Sample S.D.	CC One S.D.	CC Three S.D.	CC Four S.D.	CC Five S.D.
1	.77	.72	.57	.63	.76	.66
2	.74	.72	.73	.66	.73	.67
3	.84	.83	.93	.80	.83	.75
4	.97	.86	.68	.75	.96	.61
5	.85	.78	.61	.67	.86	.77
6	.94	.84	.67	.78	.97	.66
7	.69	.65	.77	.52	.68	.61
8	.81	.71	.65	.54	.75	.67
9	.98	.88	.69	.89	.92	.84
10	1.03	.93	.61	.87	1.00	.72
11	.83	.76	.65	.66	.71	.64
12	.91	.92	.75	.78	.90	.84
13	.77	.73	.85	.62	.73	.56
14	.90	.88	.86	.81	.86	.63
15	.92	.78	.77	.69	.83	.65
16	.72	.68	.79	.62	.57	.62
17	1.10	1.05	1.15	1.05	1.07	.83
18	.92	.95	1.12	.80	.92	.77
19	.77	.64	.61	.67	.60	.63
20	.84	.69	.71	.69	.66	.68
Average	.865	.8	.7585	.725	.8155	.6905

twenty non-sample discrepancies were averaged, the average discrepancy was +.969. When the twenty sample discrepancies were averaged, the average discrepancy was +.7605, a difference of .2085, or 21.5 percent smaller average discrepancies for the sample group. For complete data, see Table V, page 45.

The sample group discrepancies appeared to be different from the non-sample group discrepancies in that the sample group demonstrated: (1) a 9.8 percent smaller range, (2) smaller discrepancies in 95 percent of the cases, and (3) 21.5 percent smaller average discrepancies.

In summary, when comparing means, standard deviations, and discrepancies of the two groups, and when using the averages of these measures, the sample group appeared to demonstrate the most difference from the non-sample group in discrepancies: 21.5 percent smaller average discrepancies. The sample group consisted of four community colleges believed to be more involved in systematic planning efforts than the community colleges in the non-sample group.

Comparison of Data Among Four Institutions in Sample

A comparison of data among the four sample institutions was made by analyzing the data: (1) for assessing the degree of systematic planning practiced at each of the four community colleges, and (2) for assessing the degree of goal agreement among administrators at each of the four community colleges.

Degree of Systematic Planning

The degree of systematic planning practiced at each of the four community colleges was assessed by three methods: (1) an analysis of

Table V

Discrepancies Between Means of Responses to Goal Areas as Perceived and Preferred to be Important

Goal Area	Non-Sample Disc.	Sample Disc.	CC One Disc.	CC Three Disc.	CC Four Disc.	CC Five Disc.
1	+ .61	+ .59	+ .85	+ .46	+ .59	+ .56
2	+1.16	+ .85	+1.04	+ .61	+ .90	+ .90
3	+ .98	+ .61	+1.16	+ .38	+ .41	+ .88
4	+ .78	+ .63	+ .78	+ .57	+ .67	+ .56
5	+1.26	+ .79	+1.37	+ .71	+ .64	+ .83
6	+1.16	+ .86	+1.29	+ .81	+ .74	+ .98
7	+ .88	+ .62	+ .87	+ .34	+ .54	+ .90
8	+1.35	+ .88	+1.65	+ .65	+ .71	+1.08
9	+ .90	+ .59	+1.40	+ .32	+ .41	+ .71
10	+ .80	+ .51	+1.16	+ .22	+ .39	+ .70
11	+ .95	+ .75	+1.50	+ .70	+ .66	+ .48
12	+ .62	+ .54	+1.04	+ .33	+ .51	+ .41
13	+1.12	+ .93	+1.19	+ .32	+1.06	+1.27
14	+1.17	+1.14	+1.90	+ .69	+1.23	+ .94
15	+1.17	+ .96	+1.81	+ .50	+ .89	+1.11
16	+1.56	+1.41	+1.81	+1.06	+1.42	+1.67
17	+ .33	+ .31	+ .41	+ .20	+ .46	+ .14
18	+ .55	+ .30	+ .87	+ .11	+ .25	+ .20
19	+1.14	+ .98	+1.59	+ .84	+ .60	+1.59
20	+ .89	+ .96	+1.26	+ .58	+ .80	+1.56
Average	+ .969	+ .7605	+1.2475	+ .52	+ .694	+ .8735

the data reported by administrators for the individual CCGI goal statement which addressed the importance of being organized for systematic short and long-range planning for the whole institution, (2) an analysis of the data reported by administrators for six statements which addressed the adequacy of certain factors believed to be important to systematic planning, including one statement on mission and goals, and (3) the opinion of Kinnison.

According to the average discrepancy between the means of responses to the individual CCGI goal statement, Community College Four demonstrated the smallest discrepancy, +.27, Community College Three demonstrated the second smallest, +1, Community College One the third smallest, +1.5, and Community College Five the largest discrepancy, +1.92. In all cases, the average means were higher for responses to the goal statement as administrators preferred it to be important than as they perceived it to be important at their institutions. For complete data, see Table VI, page 47.

Based on responses to the individual CCGI goal statement, administrators ranked their institutions, from most organized to least organized for systematic short and long-range planning for the whole institution, as Community Colleges Four, Three, One, and Five.

According to the average means of responses to the six statements on current planning practices as a total, Community College Four demonstrated the highest average mean, 6.139, Community College Three the second highest, 5.9895, Community College One the third highest, 5.375, and Community College Five the lowest, 4.2692. For complete data, see Table VII, page 47.

Based on administrative responses to the six statements as a

Table VI

Discrepancies Between Means of Responses to CCGI Goal Statement on Systematic Institutional Planning

Sample	Number	Mean of Perceived Importance	Mean of Preferred Importance	Discrepancy
Total	73	3.49	4.44	+ .95
CC One	8	2.88	4.38	+1.50
CC Three	17	3.35	4.35	+1.00
CC Four	31	4.26	4.53	+ .27
CC Five	13	2.46	4.38	+1.92

Table VII

Means of Responses to Six Statements on Current Planning Practices

Statement	CC One Mean	CC Three Mean	CC Four Mean	CC Five Mean
1	6.4375	6.823	8.048	5.423
2	3.6875	5.235	5.887	2.8076
3	4.1875	5.352	5.98	3.6538
4	5.5625	6.352	5.5	4.6538
5	7.0625	5.823	5.5	5.5
6	5.3125	6.352	5.919	3.5769
Average	5.375	5.9895	6.139	4.2692

total, administrators ranked their institutions, from most adequate to least adequate in current planning practices, as Community Colleges Four, Three, One, and Five. This ranking matched that determined by responses to the CCGI goal statement.

According to the average means of responses to the one statement on mission and goals, statement one in Table VII, Community College Four demonstrated the highest mean, 8.048, Community College Three the second highest, 6.823, Community College One the third highest, 6.4375, and Community College Five the lowest mean, 5.423.

Based on responses to statement one, administrators ranked their institutions, from most adequate to least adequate in the current statement of mission and goals, as Community Colleges Four, Three, One, and Five. This ranking matched that determined by responses to both the CCGI goal statement and the six statements as a total on current planning practices.

When Kinnison was asked to rank the four community colleges, from most systematic to least systematic in planning, he divided the four into groups of two. Based on his professional judgment, Kinnison assessed Community Colleges Four and Three to be more systematic in planning than Community Colleges One and Five. He also advised the investigator to compare the CCGI data in groups of two, rather than in a one-through-four ranking. Kinnison's groupings were consistent with the other methods utilized to assess the degree of systematic planning practiced at each of the four sample institutions.

Degree of Goal Agreement

The degree of goal agreement at the four community colleges was

assessed in groups of two, with Community Colleges Four and Three judged to be more systematic in planning than Community Colleges One and Five. The specific measures utilized in the analysis of the data which assessed the degree of goal agreement among administrators at the four community colleges were: (1) standard deviations of responses to twenty goal areas both as they were perceived to be important and as they were preferred to be important, and (2) discrepancies between the means of responses to twenty goal areas as they were perceived to be important and as they were preferred to be important.

The assumption was made that the smaller the standard deviation, the greater the goal agreement, and the smaller the discrepancy, the greater the goal agreement between the perception of present reality and the way things should be.

Standard deviations. The smallest and largest standard deviations from the means of responses to all twenty goal areas as they were perceived to be important by administrators at their institutions were .72 and 1.0 for CC Four, a range of .28. The smallest and largest standard deviations for CC Three were .67 and 1.08, a range of .41. The smallest and largest standard deviations for CC One were .57 and 1.12, a range of .55. The smallest and largest standard deviations for CC Five were .55 and .89, a range of .34.

When compared in groups of twos, the two community colleges judged to be more systematic in planning demonstrated an average range of standard deviations of .345. The two community colleges judged to be less systematic in planning demonstrated an average range of standard deviations of .445, a 22.5 percent smaller range for the systematic-

planning colleges.

When the twenty standard deviations were averaged for each of the four community colleges, CC Five demonstrated the smallest average standard deviation, .761. Community College Four demonstrated the second smallest, .818. Community College Three demonstrated the third smallest, .826. Community College One demonstrated the largest, .845.

When compared in groups of twos, the two community colleges judged to be more systematic in planning demonstrated an average standard deviation of .822. The two community colleges judged to be less systematic in planning demonstrated an average standard deviation of .803, a 2.4 percent larger average standard deviation for the systematic-planning colleges. For complete data, see Table III, page 41.

The smallest and largest standard deviations from the means of responses to all twenty goal areas as they were preferred to be important by administrators at their institutions were .57 and 1.07 for CC Four, a range of .50. The smallest and largest standard deviations for CC Three were .52 and 1.05, a range of .53. The smallest and largest standard deviations for CC One were .57 and 1.15, a range of .58. The smallest and largest standard deviations for CC Five were .56 and .84, a range of .28.

When compared in groups of twos, the two community colleges judged to be more systematic in planning demonstrated an average range of standard deviations of .515. The two community colleges judged to be less systematic in planning demonstrated an average range of standard deviations of .43, a 19.8 percent wider average range of standard deviations for the systematic-planning colleges.

When the twenty standard deviations for each of the four com-

munity colleges were averaged for each of the four community colleges, CC Five demonstrated the smallest average standard deviation, .6905. Community College Three demonstrated the second smallest, .725. Community College One demonstrated the third smallest, .7585. Community College Four demonstrated the largest, .8155.

When compared in groups of twos, the two community colleges judged to be more systematic in planning demonstrated an average standard deviation of .77025. The two community colleges judged to be less systematic in planning demonstrated an average standard deviation of .7245, a 6.3 percent larger average standard deviation for the systematic-planning colleges. For complete data, see Table IV, page 43.

As measured by standard deviations, no consistent relationship was found between systematic planning and goal agreement.

Discrepancies. The smallest and largest discrepancies between the means of responses to all twenty goal areas as they were perceived to be important and as they were preferred to be important by administrators at their institutions were .25 and 1.42 for CC Four, a range of 1.17. The smallest and largest discrepancies for CC Three were .11 and 1.06, a range of .95. The smallest and largest discrepancies for CC One were .41 and 1.90, a range of 1.49. The smallest and largest discrepancies for CC Five were .14 and 1.67, a range of 1.53.

When compared in groups of twos, the two community colleges judged to be more systematic in planning demonstrated an average range of discrepancies of 1.06. The two community colleges judged to be less systematic in planning demonstrated an average range of discrepancies of 1.51, a 29.8 percent smaller average range for the systematic-planning

colleges.

When the twenty discrepancies were averaged for each of the four community colleges, CC Three demonstrated the smallest average discrepancy, .52. Community College Four demonstrated the second smallest, .694. Community College Five demonstrated the third smallest, .8735. Community College One demonstrated the largest, 1.2475.

When compared in groups of twos, the two community colleges judged to be more systematic in planning demonstrated an average discrepancy of .607. The two community colleges judged to be less systematic in planning demonstrated an average discrepancy of 1.0605, a 42.8 percent smaller average discrepancy for the systematic-planning colleges. For complete data, see Table V, page 45.

As measured by discrepancy, a consistent relationship was found between systematic planning and goal agreement.

Test of Hypothesis

The null hypothesis of this study was: There is no relationship between a community college's use of a systematic approach to planning and goal agreement among administrators.

The hypothesis was tested by asking the question: Will administrators at those community colleges which use a more systematic approach to planning express closer agreement toward the goals of their institution than administrators at community colleges which use a less systematic approach to planning? Two statistical measures of agreement were utilized: (1) standard deviations of responses to twenty goal areas both as they were perceived to be important and as they were preferred to be important, and discrepancies between the means of responses

to twenty goal areas as they were perceived to be important and as they were preferred to be important at the respondent's institution.

By the measure of standard deviations--ranges, frequencies, and averages--no consistent relationship was found between a community college's use of a systematic approach to planning and goal agreement among administrators. In a comparison of data between the sample and non-sample groups, the sample group demonstrated: (1) a 29.2 percent wider range of perceived-importance standard deviations, (2) smaller perceived-importance standard deviations in 70 percent of the cases, (3) 4.7 percent smaller average perceived-importance standard deviations, (4) smaller preferred-importance standard deviations in 90 percent of the cases, and (5) 7.5 percent smaller average preferred-importance standard deviations.

In a comparison of data between the two community colleges judged to be more systematic in planning and the other two, the former demonstrated: (1) a 22.5 percent smaller range of perceived-importance standard deviations, (2) a 2.4 percent larger average perceived-importance standard deviation, (3) a 19.8 percent wider average range of preferred-importance standard deviations, and (4) 6.3 percent larger average preferred-importance standard deviations.

By the measure of discrepancies--ranges, frequencies, and averages--a consistent relationship was found between a community college's use of a systematic approach to planning and goal agreement among administrators. In a comparison of data between the sample and non-sample groups, the sample group demonstrated: (1) a 9.8 percent smaller range, (2) smaller discrepancies in 95 percent of the cases, and (3) 21.5 percent smaller average discrepancies. The sample group consisted

of four community colleges believed to be more involved in systematic planning than the community colleges in the non-sample group.

In a comparison of data between the two community colleges judged to be more systematic in planning and the other two, the former demonstrated: (1) a 29.8 percent smaller average range, and (2) a 42.8 percent smaller average discrepancy.

Based on the results of this study, a consistent and positive relationship was found between a community college's use of a systematic approach to planning and goal agreement among administrators, as measured by discrepancies. An inconsistent relationship was found as measured by standard deviations.

Chapter V

CONCLUSIONS

This study began by asking the question: Will administrators in those community colleges which use a more systematic approach to planning express closer agreement toward the goals of their institution than administrators at community colleges which use a less systematic approach to planning? The answer to this question as found in this study will be explored in chapter five. Conclusions will be drawn from the information presented in the first four chapters and recommendations will be made for future research in the area of systematic planning. In addition, certain conditions which appear to enhance the successful implementation of systematic planning will be described.

Summary

During the last half of the 1970s, a number of community colleges became involved in planning, more specifically in comprehensive, systematic short and long-range planning. The changing demographic, economic, and social environment of the 1980s indicated a need for college and university administrators to become more effective and efficient in their decision making in order to achieve institutional goals. Among the many benefits anticipated by community colleges involved in systematic planning efforts were that systematic planning would help them continuously assess their mission and goals against the changing needs of the communities they served and, therefore, provide a continuously updated rational framework for decision making.

Evidence suggested if an institution's goals could be clearly stated and agreed upon, administrators and other decision makers would be more likely, as well as more able, to make decisions supportive of those goals. To the extent the primary decision-making group, administrators, agreed on the goals of the institution, then individual and group decisions might be expected to be more efficiently and effectively directed toward the attainment of those goals.

While the literature reviewed did not reveal any documented studies involving systematic planning and its relationship to goal agreement, it did reveal interrelated discussion concerning systematic planning, goal setting, goal agreement or consensus, and decision making. Theory, research, and the experiences of a number of community colleges detailed in the literature supported a positive relationship between systematic planning or goal setting, and more effective and efficient decision making. The current study did not ask respondents their opinions regarding a possible relationship between systematic planning and decision making per se. However, it did ask administrators to assess the adequacy of the relationship at their institutions between planning and other systems for managing the institution: Management Information Systems or MIS, decision making, and Management by Objectives or MBO. The four institutions self-ranked their degree of adequacy in management systems in exactly the same order they self-ranked their overall degree of systematic planning. For complete data, see Table VII, statement three, page 47.

Conclusions

After careful study of the related literature and the findings

reported in chapter four, the investigator offers the following conclusions:

1. Administrators at community colleges who perceive their institutions to be more systematic in planning also are more likely to perceive smaller gaps between what are, and what should be the goals of their institutions.

2. These administrators also are more likely to perceive: (a) relatively smaller gaps between the importance of planning as it is, and as it should be at their institutions, (b) current planning practices, as a whole, to be more adequate at their institutions, and (c) specific planning and management practices--statement of mission and goals, MIS, decision making, MBO, and budgeting--to be more adequate at their institutions.

3. Certain conditions appear to enhance the success of systematic planning efforts: (a) commitment and leadership of the chief executive officer, (b) participation of faculty, students, boards of trustees, administrators, and community people, (c) capability to support the planning process with data and information on a timely and accurate basis, and in a reasonably simple format, (d) a budgeting process inextricably tied to the planning process, and (e) an evaluation process inextricably tied to the planning process.

Based on the results of this study, it would appear that community colleges can utilize systematic planning to assist administrators and others reach closer agreement between goals as they are, and as they should be important at an institution. Horwitz found that when a group goal was fully accepted by a member he would be more likely to be involved in efforts toward group goal attainment (22). To the extent

members of the primary decision-making group understand and agree on the goals of the institution, then individual and group efforts--including decisions--could be expected to be more efficiently and effectively directed toward the attainment of those goals.

The investigator offers the following recommendations to those who are interested in conducting further study in the area of systematic planning:

1. The Freeman study at the University of Pittsburgh and the Van Ausdle study at Walla Walla Community College may provide direction for further study.

2. The six-statement instrument developed by the investigator and Kinnison for assessing current planning practices proved to be consistent with the findings of the CCGI goal statement on planning and the opinion of an expert. Based on the results of this study, the first three statements of the instrument in Appendix B were more consistent with the results of the other methods than the last three statements.

3. For those who might wish to conduct study among the four community colleges utilized in this study, the investigator would be willing to query the presidents for permission to reveal the identity of the colleges.

Many benefits, in addition to more rational decision making, were ascribed to systematic planning in the literature. According to the Higher Education Management Institute, planning: (1) develops and clarifies institutional philosophy, goals, and objectives, (2) promotes an orderly approach to problem solving, (3) promotes team building, (4) improves communication, (5) promotes credible external relations, (6) facilitates performance evaluation, (7) encourages professional

development, (8) contributes to job satisfaction, (9) provides a framework for management and decision making, and (10) enhances collegiality. H.E.M.I. also described some of the costs and limitations of planning, among them that it required staff and faculty time, and that several years were required in order to develop a good planning process. Planning also may disturb the status quo, stimulate conflict, and increase personal stress. According to H.E.M.I., planning cannot overcome immediate crises, anticipate or control future events, or guarantee success (20). Kinnison also succinctly summarized a variety of benefits and limitations of institutional planning (26:I-1-2).

To chief executive officers and others who are interested in implementing an ongoing, comprehensive, systematic planning process, the investigator offers the following recommendations:

1. Expect that the process will take several years to implement fully. Consider enlisting the assistance of an external change agent, or consultant, to facilitate the process.

2. Be aware that the process of planning is at least as important as the plan. Because of the rapidly changing conditions affecting higher education, consider labeling all plans, "rough draft."

3. Consider and plan for conditions which appear to enhance the success of systematic planning efforts, the most influential of which may be the commitment and leadership of the chief executive officer. According to Byron McClenney, chief executive officer at Parkersburg Community College, "a good planning process, if successful, will enable the president to anticipate changes in the future, clarify organizational priorities, and fairly allocate resources." (32:3)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

68

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Ackoff, Russell L. A Concept of Corporate Planning. New York: Wiley, 1970.

2. Altieri, Donald P. Institutional Long Range Planning. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 160 162, 1977.

3. Application for Grants Under the Strengthening Developing Institutions Program, U. S., Office of Education, OE Form 1049-1, December 10, 1979.

4. Beckhard, Richard. Organization Development: Strategies and Models. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1969.

5. Bers, John A. Building the Planning Process Into College Management. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 143 405, 1977.

6. Blake, Robert R., and Jane Mouton. Building a Dynamic Corporation through Grid Organization. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1969.

7. Brueder, Robert L., and Maxwell C. King. "Institutional Goals in Planning." Community and Junior College Journal. 47:8-12, December-January, 1976-77.

8. Cartwright, Dorwin, and Alvin Zander. Group Dynamics: Research and Theory. 2d ed. Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson and Company, 1960.

9. Central, John A. "Reading the Enrollment Barometer." Change. 11:50-62, April, 1979.

10. Chronicle of Higher Education. 20:8, June 9, 1980.

11. "College in 2000: Is Less More?" Science News. 117:55, January 26, 1980.

12. Cohen, A. M., and J. Lombardi. "Can the Community Colleges Survive Success?" Change. 11:24-27, November-December, 1979.

13. Drucker, Peter F. The Practice of Management. New York: Harper and Row, 1954.

14. Ellison, Nolen M. "Strategic Planning." Community and Junior College Journal. 48:32-5, September, 1977.

15. Etzioni, Amitai. Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.

16. Freeman, Jack E. "Comprehensive Planning in Higher Education." New Directions for Higher Education: Managing Turbulence and Change. 19:33-52, Autumn, 1977.

17. Gross, Edward, and Paul V. Grambsch. University Goals and Academic Power. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1968.

18. Halstead, D. Kent. Statewide Planning in Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1974.

19. Higher Education Act of 1965. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1965.

20. Higher Education Management Institute's Institutional Planning Module. 2.1.1:Transparency #4. Coconut Grove, Florida: Higher Education Management Institute, 1979.

21. Hill, William E., and Charles H. Granger. "Long Range Corporate Planning." The Encyclopedia of Management. New York: Reinhold, 1963.

22. Horwitz, Murray. "The Recall of Interrupted Group Tasks: An Experimental Study of Individual Motivation in Relation to Group Goals." Human Relations. 7:3-37, 1954.

23. Hughes, Charles L. Goal Setting: Key to Individual and Organizational Effectiveness. New York: American Management Association, 1965.

24. Jones, Sherman. "Faculty Involvement in College and University Decision Making." New Directions for Higher Education: Managing Turbulence and Change. 19:81-90, Autumn, 1977.

25. Kerr, Clark. "Changes and Challenges Ahead for Community Colleges." Community and Junior College Journal. 50:4-10, May, 1980.

26. Kinnison, Charles J. Long and Short Range Planning for Community Colleges. Washington, D.C.: McManis Associates, Inc., 1979.

27. Kinnison, Charles J. Outcomes Oriented Planning, Management, and Evaluation. Washington, D.C.: McManis Associates, Inc., 1978.

28. Knoell, Dorothy, and Charles McIntyre. Planning Colleges for the Community. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

29. Latham, Gary P., and Edwin A. Locke. "Goal-Setting: An Organizational Technique that Works." Organizational Dynamics. 8:68-80, Autumn, 1979.

30. Lippitt, Gordon L. "Group Dynamics." The Encyclopedia of Management. New York: Reinhold, 1963.

31. McClenney, Byron. Consortium on Planning for Fiscal Stability, San Francisco, March 28, 1980.

32. McClenney, Byron. "Planning and the President's Role." ACCTion Review. 4:3, June 30, 1979.

33. McGregor, Douglas. The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

34. McManis, Gerald L. Planning, Management and Evaluation. Washington, D.C.: McManis Associates, Inc., 1976.

35. McManis, Gerald L., and James Harvey. Planning, Management, and Evaluation Systems in Higher Education. Littleton, Colorado: Ireland Educational Corporation, 1978.

36. Merson, John C., and Robert L. Qualls. Strategic Planning for Colleges and Universities: A Systems Approach to Planning and Resource Allocation. San Antonio: Trinity University Press, 1980.

37. Miller, Eldon. "You Plan, But How Well?" ACCTion Review, 4:2, June 30, 1979.

38. Millett, John D. "Managing Turbulence and Change," New Directions for Higher Education: Managing Turbulence and Change. 5:vii, Autumn, 1977.

39. Millett, John D., ed. Planning in Higher Education: A Manual for Colleges and Universities. Washington, D.C.: Academy for Educational Development, Inc., 1977.

40. Parekh, Satish B. A Long Range Planning Model for Colleges and Universities. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 116 519, 1975.

41. Parekh, Satish B. Long Range Planning: An Institution-Wide Approach to Increasing Academic Vitality. New Rochelle, New York: Change Magazine Press, 1977.

42. Perry, Richard R. "Goal-Oriented Research: An Institution's Paradigm." New Directions for Institutional Research: Using Goals in Research and Planning. 19:49-59, 1978.

43. Peterson, Richard E. "The Institutional Goals Inventory in Contemporary Context." New Directions for Institutional Research: Using Goals in Research and Planning. 19:31-47, 1978.

44. Porter, R. W. Design for Industrial Coordination. New York: Harper and Row, 1941.

45. Randolph, Robert W. Planagement: Moving Concept into Reality. Austin: Learning Concepts, 1979.

46. Report to the Congress of the United States. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1979.

47. Richardson, Richard C., Jr., Don E. Gardner, and Ann Pierce. The Need for Institutional Planning. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 144 511, 1977.

48. Richardson, Richard D., Jr., Clyde E. Blocker, and Louis W. Bender. Governance for the Two-Year College. Englewood, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

49. Roueche, John E., George A. Baker, III, and Richard L. Brownell. "Accountability for Student Learning in Community Colleges." Educational Technology. 11:46-47, January, 1971.

50. Scott, W. Richard. "Theory of Organizations." Handbook of Modern Organizations. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1964.

51. Shoemaker, William A. "A Systems Approach to College Administration and Planning: A Descriptive Comparison of Selected Models, Programs, and Services Suitable for Use in Small Colleges." PhD dissertation, Temple University, 1973.

52. Simmons, John D. "Long Range Planning: Financial Aspects." The Encyclopedia of Management. New York: Reinhold Publishing Corporation, 1973.

53. Thibaut, John W., and Harold Kelley. The Social Psychology of Groups. New York: Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1959.

54. Thompson, James D., and William J. McEwen. "Organizational Goals and Environment: Goal Setting as an Interactive Process." American Sociological Review. 23:23-31, February, 1958.

55. Zaltman, Gerald, David H. Florio, and Linda A. Sikorski. Dynamic Educational Change: Models, Strategies, Tactics, and Management. New York: Free Press, Inc., 1977.

APPENDIX A

NINETY GOAL STATEMENTS IN COMMUNITY COLLEGE GOALS INVENTORY

NINETY GOAL STATEMENTS IN COMMUNITY
COLLEGE GOALS INVENTORY

1. To ensure that students acquire a basic knowledge of communications, the humanities, social sciences, mathematics, and natural sciences.

2. To teach students methods of inquiry, research, and problem definition and solution.

3. To offer courses that enable adults in the community to pursue vocational, cultural, and social interests.

4. To ensure that students who graduate have achieved some level of reading, writing, and math competency.

5. To increase the desire and ability of students to undertake self-directed learning.

6. To provide a general academic background as preparation for further, more advanced or specialized work.

7. To develop students' ability to synthesize knowledge from a variety of sources.

8. To seek to instill in students a commitment to a lifetime of learning.

9. To ensure that students acquire knowledge and skills that will enable them to live effectively in society.

10. To instill in students a capacity for openness to new ideas and ways of thinking.

11. To be committed as a college to providing learning opportunities to adults of all ages.

12. To encourage students to learn about foreign cultures, for example, through study of a foreign language.

13. To award degree credit for knowledge and skills acquired in non-school settings.

14. To increase students' sensitivity to and appreciation of various forms of art and artistic expression.

15. To help students identify their personal goals and develop means of achieving them.

16. To help students understand and assess the important moral issues of our time.

17. To encourage students to elect courses in the humanities or arts beyond required course work.

18. To help students develop a sense of self-worth, self-confidence, and self-direction.

19. To help students understand and respect people from diverse backgrounds and cultures.

20. To encourage students to express themselves artistically, such as in music, painting, and film-making.

21. To help students achieve deeper levels of self-understanding.

22. To encourage students to become committed to working for peace in the world.

23. To acquaint students with forms of artistic or literary expression from non-Western cultures, such as African or Asian.

24. To help students to be open, honest, and trusting in their relationships with others.

25. To encourage students to have an active concern for the general welfare of their communities.

26. To provide opportunities for students to prepare for specific vocational/technical careers, such as accounting, air conditioning, and nursing.

27. To identify and assess basic skills levels and then counsel students relative to their needs.

28. To make available to community groups college resources such as meeting rooms, computer facilities, and faculty problem-solving skills.

29. To provide critical evaluations of current values and practices in our society.

30. To offer educational programs geared to new and emerging career fields.

31. To ensure that students who complete developmental programs have achieved appropriate reading, writing, and mathematics competencies.

32. To offer alternative developmental (basic skills) programs that recognize different learning styles and rates.

33. To serve as a source of ideas and recommendations for changing social institutions.

34. To convene or conduct community forums on topical issues such as conservation of energy, crime prevention, and community renewal.

35. To cooperate with diverse community organizations to improve the availability of educational services to area residents.

36. To provide opportunities for individuals to update or upgrade present job skills.

37. To work with local government agencies, industries, unions, and other community groups on community problems.

38. To provide retraining opportunities for individuals who wish to qualify for new careers or acquire new job skills.

39. To help students learn how to bring about changes in our social, economic, or political institutions.

40. To be engaged, as an institution, in working for basic changes in our society.

41. To evaluate continuously the effectiveness of basic skills instruction.

42. To maintain support services for students with special needs, such as disadvantaged, or handicapped.

43. To commit college resources to faculty and staff development activities.

44. To provide career counseling services for students.

45. To conduct a comprehensive student activities program consisting of social, cultural, and athletic activities.

46. To provide opportunities for professional development of faculty and staff through special seminars, workshops, or training programs.

47. To provide personal counseling services for students.

48. To provide comprehensive advice for students about financial aid sources.

49. To evaluate faculty in an appropriate and reasonable manner in order to promote effective teaching.

50. To provide academic advising services for students.

51. To operate a student job-placement service.

52. To operate a student health service that includes health maintenance, preventive medicine, and referral services.

53. To provide flexible leave and sabbatical opportunities for faculty and staff for purposes of professional development.

54. To create a campus climate in which students spend much of their free time in intellectual and cultural activities.

55. To build a climate on the campus in which continuous educational innovation is accepted as an institutional way of life.

56. To maintain a climate in which faculty commitment to the goals and well-being of the institution is as strong as commitment to professional careers.

57. To create a climate in which students and faculty may easily come together for informal discussions of ideas and mutual interests.

58. To experiment with different methods of evaluating and grading student performance.

59. To maintain a climate in which communication throughout the organizational structure is open and candid.

60. To sponsor each year a rich program of cultural events, such as lectures, concerts, and art exhibits.

61. To experiment with new approaches to individualized instruction such as tutorials, flexible scheduling, and students planning their own programs.

62. To maintain a climate at the college in which differences of opinions can be aired openly and amicably.

63. To create an institution known in the community as an intellectually exciting and stimulating place.

64. To create procedures by which curricular and instructional innovations may be readily initiated.

65. To maintain a climate of mutual trust and respect among students, faculty, and administrators.

66. To ensure that students are not prevented from hearing speakers presenting controversial points of view.

67. To set student tuition and fees at a level such that no one will be denied attendance because of financial need.

68. To involve those with appropriate expertise in making important campus decisions.

69. To ensure the freedom of students and faculty to choose their own life styles, such as living arrangements and personal appearances.

70. To offer programs at off-campus locations and at times that accommodate adults in the community.

71. To maintain or work to achieve a large degree of autonomy or independence in relation to governmental or other educational agencies.

72. To achieve general consensus on the campus regarding fundamental college goals.

73. To place no restrictions on off-campus political activities by faculty or students.

74. To recruit students who in the past have been denied, have not valued, or have not been successful in formal education.

75. To be organized for systematic short- and long-range planning for the whole institution.

76. To protect the right of faculty members to present unpopular or controversial ideas in the classroom.

77. To maintain or move to a policy of essentially open admissions, and then to develop worthwhile educational experiences for all who are admitted.

78. To engage in systematic evaluation of all college programs.

79. To consider benefits in relation to costs in deciding among alternative college programs.

80. To include local citizens in planning college programs that will affect the local community.

81. To provide regular evidence that the institution is actually achieving its stated goals.

82. To interpret systematically the nature, purpose, and work of the college to local citizens.

83. To monitor the efficiency with which college operations are conducted.

84. To provide educational experiences relevant to the interests of blacks, Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, and Native Americans.

85. To develop arrangements by which students, faculty, administrators, and trustees can be significantly involved in college policy making.

86. To seek to maintain high standards of academic performance throughout the institution.

87. To be accountable to funding sources for the effectiveness of college programs.

88. To excel in intercollegiate athletics.

89. To provide educational experiences relevant to the interests of women.

90. To serve as a cultural center in the community.

APPENDIX B

SIX STATEMENTS IN CURRENT PLANNING PRACTICES ASSESSMENT

SIX STATEMENTS IN CURRENT PLANNING PRACTICES ASSESSMENT

1. The current statement of mission and goals at this community college is:

2. The relationship between planning and budget preparation at this community college is:

3. The relationship between planning and other systems for managing (e.g., MIS, decision making, MBO) at this community college is:

4. The capability to support planning with institutional research at this community college is:

5. The capability to support planning with data-based management information at this community college is:

6. The capability to evaluate institutional performance at this community college is:

APPENDIX C

LETTER FROM KINNISON

McManis Associates, Inc.
Washington, D.C. and San Jose, California

July 1, 1980

Ms. Nancy Stetson
Information and Development Officer
Wenatchee Valley College
1300 Fifth Street
Wenatchee, Washington 98801

Dear Nancy:

For purposes of confidentiality, I understand that you have coded the four institutions that are participating in your thesis study as sub-groups one, three, four and five.

From my professional point of view, all four institutions are involved in varying degrees in either designing, developing, implementing, or refining comprehensive planning systems. It is my opinion that sub-groups one and five are less involved in systematic planning than sub-groups three and four.

I would suggest that, rather than try to rank the four institutions from least to most involved in systematic planning, you examine the data results in groups of two each, one group being more systematic in planning and the other group being less systematic.

If I can be of any further help to you in your study, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Charles J. Kinnison
Principal Associate

CJK:lc

APPENDIX D

TWENTY GOAL AREAS IN COMMUNITY COLLEGE GOALS INVENTORY

TWENTY GOAL AREAS IN COMMUNITY COLLEGE GOALS INVENTORY

The numbers in parentheses are the numbers of the four goal statements that make up each area. Goal statements 12, 71, 80, 82, 84, 85, 86, 88, 89, and 90 from Appendix A are not incorporated in the twenty goal areas.

Outcome Goals

1. General Education: the acquisition of general and specialized knowledge, preparation of students for further academic work, and the acquisition of skills and knowledge to live effectively in society (1, 4, 6, 9).

2. Intellectual Orientation: an attitude about learning and intellectual work, familiarity with research and problem solving methods, the ability to synthesize knowledge from many sources, the capacity for self-directed learning, and an openness to new ideas and ways of thinking (2, 5, 7, 10).

3. Lifelong Learning: providing non-credit courses to community residents who can pursue a variety of interests, instilling in students a commitment to lifelong learning, providing learning opportunities to adults of all ages, and awarding educational credit for knowledge and skills acquired in non-school settings (3, 8, 11, 13).

4. Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness: a heightened appreciation of a variety of art forms, encouraging study in the humanities and art beyond requirements, exposure to non-western art and literature, and encouragement of student participation in artistic activities (14, 17, 20, 23).

5. Personal Development: identification by students of personal goals and developing means for achieving them, enhancement of feelings of self-worth, self-confidence, and self-direction, and encouragement of open and honest relationships (15, 18, 21, 24).

6. Humanism/Altruism: a respect for diverse cultures, a commitment to working for peace in the world, an understanding of the important moral issues of the time, and concern about the general welfare of the community (16, 19, 22, 25).

7. Vocational/Technical Preparation: offering specific occupational curriculums (such as accounting or air-conditioning and refrigeration), programs geared to emerging career fields, opportunities for up-grading/up-dating present job skills, and retraining for new careers or new job skills (26, 30, 36, 38).

8. Developmental/Remedial Preparation: recognizing, assessing, and counseling students with basic skills needs, providing developmental programs that recognize different learning styles and rates, assuring that students in developmental programs achieve appropriate levels of competence, and evaluating basic skills programs (27, 31, 32, 41).

9. Community Services: the college's relationship with the community: encouraging use of college resources (meeting rooms, computer facilities, faculty skills), conducting community forums on topical issues, promoting cooperation among diverse community organizations to improve availability of services, and working with local government agencies, industry, unions, and other groups on community problems (28, 34, 35, 37).

10. Social Criticism: providing critical evaluation of current values and practices, serving as a source of ideas to change social institutions, helping students learn how to bring about change in our institutions, and being engaged, as an institution, in working for needed changes in our society (29, 33, 39, 40).

Process Goals

11. Counseling and Advising: providing career counseling services for students, providing personal counseling services for students, providing academic advising services for students, and providing a student job placement service (44, 47, 50, 51).

12. Student Services: developing support for students with special needs (handicapped, disadvantaged, international), providing a comprehensive student activities program--social, athletic, cultural, providing a comprehensive student financial aid program, and making available health services that offer health maintenance, preventive medicine and referral services (42, 45, 48, 52).

13. Faculty/Staff Development: a commitment of college resources to faculty and staff development activities designed to improve instructional programs, providing opportunities for professional development of faculty and staff through attendance at workshops, etc., maintaining a consistent and equitable method of faculty evaluation, and providing flexible leave and sabbatical opportunities for faculty and staff (43, 46, 49, 53).

14. Intellectual Environment: a rich program of cultural events, a college climate that encourages student free-time involvement in intellectual and cultural activities, an environment in which students and faculty can easily interact informally, and a college that has a reputation in the community as an intellectually exciting place (54, 57, 60, 63).

15. Innovation: a climate in which continuous educational innovation is an accepted way of life, established procedures for readily initiating curricular or instructional innovations, and, more specifically, experimentation with new approaches to individualized instruction and to evaluating and grading student performance (55, 58, 61, 64).

16. College Community: fostering a climate in which there is faculty and staff commitment to the goals of the college, open and candid communication, open and amicable airing of differences, and mutual trust and respect among faculty, students, and administrators (56, 62, 65, 69).

17. Freedom: protecting the right of faculty to present controversial ideas in the classroom, not preventing students from hearing controversial points of view, placing no restrictions on off-campus political activities by faculty or students, and ensuring faculty and students the freedom to choose their own life-styles (66, 69, 73, 76).

18. Accessibility: maintaining costs to students at a level that will not deny any community resident attendance because of financial needs, offering programs where and when they are convenient for adults in the community, recruiting students who have been denied, have not valued, or have not been successful in formal education, and, with a policy of open admissions, developing worthwhile educational experiences for all those admitted (67, 70, 74, 77).

19. Effective Management: involving those with appropriate expertise in making decisions, achieving general consensus regarding fundamental college goals, being organized for systematic short- and long-range planning, and engaging in systematic evaluation of all college programs (68, 72, 75, 78).

20. Accountability: use of cost criteria in deciding among alternative programs, concern for the efficiency of college operations, accountability to funding sources for program effectiveness, and regular provision of evidence that the college is meeting its stated goals (79, 81, 83, 87).

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES
96 POWELL LIBRARY BUILDING
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024

87

AUG 21 1981